

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

ANESHA NICOLAY COLEMAN,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

PATRICIA GROOM, et al.,

*Defendants.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No. 3:19-CV-01155-X-BK

**ORDER**

The Court considers the report of the United States Magistrate Judge in this action, which was referred to Magistrate Judge Renee Harris Toliver pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636.


The plaintiff filed a *pro se* complaint against the United States Postal Service and other officials [Doc. No. 1]. The plaintiff also filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP Motion”) [Doc. No. 4]. Because the IFP Motion did not provide the Court enough information to determine if the plaintiff should be granted *in forma pauperis* status, the Court ordered the plaintiff to fully respond to every inquiry in the IFP Motion [Doc. No. 5]. In response, the plaintiff’s *Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis* (“Second IFP Motion”) [Doc. No. 7] did not comply with the Court’s deficiency order. The Court issued a second deficiency order [Doc. No. 8], but the plaintiff again failed to comply [Doc. No. 9]. The Court issued a third deficiency order [Doc. No. 10]. The plaintiff responded [Doc. No. 11], but instead of complying with the Court’s order the plaintiff told Magistrate Judge Toliver: “I don’t think you

understand the rules of the court.”<sup>1</sup> The Court then issued a *Magistrate Judge’s Questionnaire* [Doc. No. 12], which inquired further about the plaintiff’s allegation of poverty, admonished the plaintiff to provide complete responses, and cautioned the plaintiff that the consequences of failing to comply with the Court’s order included possible dismissal of the case. Yet again, the plaintiff refused to comply with the Court’s orders and filed a motion for default [Doc. No. 14].

On September 18, 2019, the Magistrate Judge Toliver entered *Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation* [Doc. No. 15] that the Court should deny Plaintiff’s motions to proceed *in forma pauperis* [Docs. No. 4, 7] and dismiss the case without prejudice for failure to comply with court orders and for want of prosecution.<sup>2</sup>

Having received the Report of the United States Magistrate Judge, and no timely objections being filed, the Court is of the opinion that the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct and adopts the Magistrate Judge’s report as the findings and conclusions of the Court. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the Plaintiff’s motions to proceed *in forma pauperis* and hereby **DISMISSES** this case **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 9<sup>th</sup> day of October 2019.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BRANTLEY STARR  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff’s Response [Doc. No. 11], at 1.

<sup>2</sup> Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).